

REMARKS

Independent claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled. Independent claims 1, 9, and 11 are currently amended to clarify features of the present invention. Claims 2-8, 10, and 12 have been amended to allow the claims to be consistent with the independent claims, from which the claims depend. As claims 13 and 14 have been cancelled, all rejections with respect to the cancelled claims are moot.

On pages 5-6 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,587,969 B1 (Weinberg).

Weinberg is directed to a computer-implemented method for facilitating generation of an automated test for testing functionality of a transactional server. The method employs a testing tool that records a series of user steps executed during a user session with a server. See Weinberg, column 22, lines 55-56.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Weinberg discloses a method of generating test data based on the type of parameter of the attribute information of the data input area, wherein the data is generated from the user as disclosed by Weinberg. The Examiner further acknowledged that Weinberg allows a user to generate and edit tests. See Office Action, page 2, section 1(A).

As is clearly recited by independent claim 1, for example, in the present invention, "the test assisting program" enables a *computer* to carry out a process comprising, among other operations, "generating candidate data." [emphasis added]. Therefore, in the present invention, the computer generates candidate data. In contrast to the present invention, in Weinberg, the user simply enters data. That is, a computer does not generate data in Weinberg, as the data is simply entered by the user.

Further, as recited by currently amended independent claim 1, for example, the attribute information is defined in a given structured document by using a first tag and its parameters. See lines 4 to 7 of view file 55 in Fig. 7 of the present invention. The following features, as reflected in the language of independent claim 1, for example, are also included within the present invention: the data input area is defined in the structured document by using a second tag and its parameters (Input tags 55c and 55d in view file 55 of Fig. 7); the first and second tags share a common parameter value (Name=tx_01 on line 5 and Name="tx_01" on line 18 of view file 55 in Fig. 7); and a processing description is inserted into the structured document by using a

third tag (SELECT tag in Fig. 8).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 11 are patentable over Weinberg, as Weinberg does not disclose or teach first, second, or third tags, as identified by the language of the currently amended independent claims.

For example, Weinberg does not disclose or teach, "the data input area is defined in the structured document by using a second tag and its parameters." Assuming *arguendo* that Weinberg discloses data input areas, Weinberg does not disclose or suggest defining a data input area by using a second tag and its parameters.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 9, and 11 are patentable over Weinberg, as Weinberg does not disclose or teach the above-identified feature of the currently amended claims of the present invention. As dependent claims 2-4, 10, and 12 depend from respective independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims.

As Weinberg is silent regarding the above-identified feature, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 6, via independent claim 1, are also patentable over Weinberg.

Similarly, Applicants submit that Dantressangle does not teach or suggest, "the data input area is defined in the structured document by using a second tag and its parameters," as recited by claim 1. Rather, Dantressangle merely discloses that commands are transmitted from a browser computer to a server computer. No information is provided in Dantressangle regarding defining a data input area in a structured document by using a second tag and its parameters. Therefore, claim 7, via currently amended independent claim 1, is patentable over Dantressangle, as Dantressangle does not teach or suggest the above-identified feature.

As Gough is directed to processing of opaque and translucent images, Gough does not teach or suggest, "the data input area is defined in the structured document by using a second tag and its parameters," as recited by currently amended independent claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, claim 8, via independent claim 1 of the present invention, is patentable over Weinberg in view of Gough, as neither Weinberg nor Gough teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the claims of the present invention.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9, 11, and 13 on page 13 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over Muraishi, as Muraishi does not disclose or teach the above-quoted feature of the present invention.

Although Muraishi is directed to generation of an input data file based on screen definition information, Muraishi is silent regarding defining a data input area in a structured document by using a second tag and its parameters See Muraishi, page 3, paragraph [0060].

Therefore, the above-identified claims of the present invention are patentable over the reference, as Muraishi does not disclose or teach the above-identified feature of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent claim 15 recites inserting a processing description substantially immediately after the second tag defining the data input area, such that the candidate data will be associated with the data input area. The subject matter of claim 15 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, claim 15 is patentable over the references.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/10/06

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501